

King GEORGE'S RIGHT

ASSERTED,

AND

The Church of England

Vindicated from the Charge of

SCHISM.

Herbert Nelson

By a Presbyter of the Church of England.

*Ad Salutem Civium Civitatumq; incolumitatem, vitamq;
hominum & Quietam & Beatam, condita sunt Leges.
Cic. i. de Legib.*

I exhort therefore, that first of all, Supplications,
Prayers, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made
for all Men: For Kings, and for all that are in Autho-
rity; that they may lead a quiet and peaceable Life in
all Godliness and Honesty. 1 Tim. ii. 1.

L O N D O N

Printed for the Author, and sold by J. Harrison under the
Royal-Exchange, R. Burleigh in Amen-Corner, and Mr.
Aylworth Bookseller in Durham 1717. (Price 6d.)



To the Honourable
WILLIAM CARR, Esq;
 One of the Commissioners of
 His Majesty's Excise, &c.

AS our best and noblest Services to our God, our King, and our Country, are certainly the most Important Duty of Mankind; In this degenerate Age, where both our Altars, our Sovereignty, and our Constitution, are so insolently attack'd, by a Set of those malevolent Spirits amongst us, (fas & nefas) with Sophistry, Calumnies, and Forgeryes, more than any fair Reason or Argument, for the support of their virulent Cause (so weak when thoroughly examin'd does their whole Foundation stand). As these Boutefeus have no less an Aim, than unhinging the whole Government, and setting the Kingdom in a Flame; it is not only the Duty of every loyal Subject and good Christian to lend a helping Hand towards the stopping a Conflagration, but likewise, if possible, by a yet earlier Aid, to defeat and prevent the Incendiaries.

As I have never been wanting in my Duty, as a Servant at the Altars of God, to exert my self, in my best Ability from the Pulpit, in Defence of the Protestant Line of Succession, and the Vindication of the Establish'd Government: But finding the restless Enemies of Both still forming new Projects, and blowing up new Coals, to disturb the Publick
 Tran-

Dedication.

Tranquillity ; our increasing Dangers from them, have push'd me to so much the hardier Undertaking of this more publick Opposition to them.

This Discourse was first a Letter, tho now more enlarg'd, and more improv'd, on the Subject, to a Townsman of Newcastle ; who, amongst other things, told me, That the Charge of Schism in the Church of England, had rais'd, and would increase new Scruples, and Disturbances ; and that he believ'd there were a great many Persons in Newcastle, who had been so wrought upon by that delusive Insinuation, as to doubt their Children were not rightly baptiz'd.

Now, Worthy Sir, as I ought to assume a Boldefs, in every honest and truly Christian Undertaking ; nevertheless, it gives me no little Blush, when I take the Confidence to affix so Honourable a Name for a Patron to it. And indeed, I can make no other Apology for this Presumption, than that having the Honour to be acquainted with you, but more with your eminent Virtues, as being so hearty a Zealot for His MAJESTY, as to have both merited and received the Royal Favours. Nay, and to view you in our own yet nearer Sphere, a Person so long and so highly deserving from the Corporation of Newcastle as so often, their Worthiest Senatory Choice ; Your Zeal for whose Service has been ever so conspicuous, it suffices to display the PATRIOT in one single Instance, viz. In your posting down amongst us in Company of a Noble Earl, in the Eruption of the late unnatural Rebellion ; and in so happy a Crisis, as by your joint prevailing Influence to shut our Gates against the Entry of Rebellion ev'n into our own Newcastle-Walls, so Signal, so Shining, and so Seasonable a Service to the whole Kingdom, as deserves a much better and more correct Chronicler.

'Twas from all these Attractions, that I have dar'd in this publick manner to subscribe myself,

Honoured Sir,

Your most humble and devoted Servant,

GILBERT NELSON.

King George's Right, Asserted, &c.

HAVING discoursed with a Neighbour upon the Subject of Government, I have set down my first Thoughts, and somewhat improv'd them. I wish it may be to the Publick Advantage, as much as is necessary at this Season. I desire to serve my Country, and have yielded to her Importunity. She is wounded by her Enemies, much more by her own Children; God hath defended her, he hath favour'd our Cause, and added unto us many great Blessings, with one that secures all the rest, the Protestant Succession.

But there are some amongst us, who wou'd not have us to enjoy those Blessings, nor give thanks to God for them. One would think there was no difficulty, and nothing wanting as to this Affair, but due acknowledgment of the Divine Benignity. But Contradiction is strangely risen to such height, that our Adversaries are not now content, to jumble good Churchmen and Dissenters, under the Scandalous Name of Whig, but they condemn us of Schism and Heresy; that is to say, it is Schism to pray for the

B

the King, who is Defender of the Faith, and Heresy to preserve Orthodox Religion. If this Paradox were true, it wou'd flatly contradict *Solomon's Words, That there is no new thing under the Sun*, for this wou'd be a new thing, and tho' it be not true, it is a new Invention. The Papists themselves never thought on't before, altho' they have had a greater occasion for it, but it is very like one of their Devices, to *Divide us*.

Now those our Domestick Enemies, pretend to be lovers of *Old England*, I doubt, not *Primitive Christianity*, but *Old Popery* and *Slavery*. I shall not pretend to convince Papists, or those who could so easily be reconciled to them, seeing they had rather hear *Ave Maries*, and *Worship Saints*, than come to our Churches; But I shall endeavour to satisfy unprejudic'd and well-meaning Persons. The Controversy begins at the 13th Chap. to the Romans. *Let every Soul be Subject to the higher Powers, &c.* Solomon also saith, *who can say to a King, What dost thou?* And our Church saith, *It is not lawful to take up Arms against the King, upon any pretence whatsoever.* Therefore it is asserted, That we must submit to the Prince's *Will* in all cases, either by *Doing* or *Suffering*; because there is no Exception to the *Rule of Obedience* expressed. Here is a Difficulty I confess, and certainly great Reverence ought to be paid to Crown'd Heads, as well as Obedience to their lawful Commands. There are several degrees of Transgression, which deserve a suitable Punishment; yet the highest

(3)
highest cannot amount to *Heresy*, nor cut Men off from being Members of the Church; because this is *not* exprest *neither*. But to excuse some kind of Resistance, it is said, That *Solomon*, *St. Paul*, and our Church suppose the Prince to be executing his Office, according to the Nature of his Government; and mean no other Obedience, than Submitting to all kind of Magistrates, in the Execution of their respective Offices; because this is the end of their Power; *They are not a Terror to good Works, but to the evil*. But none are oblig'd to submit to *illegal Violence*, and herein *David* seems to be an Example. For if it signify nothing, that he kept 600 Men in Arms, and that *Saul* accounts him a *Rebel*, yet what may we suppose he would have done, if the Men of *Keilah* had stood by him? But grant that this of *David* was a particular Case, and that other single Persons have no License to act as he did; that not only particular Persons, but a *Nation* ought to suffer much, rather than oppose the Prince's Will with any Force.

Yet some exception must be implied in the General Rule of Obedience, tho' not proper to be exprest, or else the Prince must be absolute, or may be when he pleases, then no Nation can pretend to be a *Free People*, and all Laws would be insignificant; nay, all Laws would be so many acts of Rebellion, and no form of Government would be lawful, but that of *Turkey*. But *Princes have no Right to be Absolute*. Thus saith the Lord, *Let it suffice you, O Princes of Israel;*

Israel; remove Violence and Spoil, and execute Justice and Judgment take away your Exactions from my People, saith the Lord God, Ezek. 45. 9. Where there is no absolute Authority, there can be no absolute Subjection due.

As divers Scriptures must necessarily be understood with limitation: So especially must the Rule of Obedience; because it is of the greatest consequence. Tho' it be least of all to be limited, yet *Self-defence* must be allowed to a State, because the contrary Opinion tends to a general Evil, even to the Ruin of Mankind; it destroys the Law of *Self-preservation*. If unlimited Obedience were a Duty, the World had been very criminal; for it has been very little practiced: If it were generally received, what Ruin would there be in the World? But then the Scripture saith, *The King's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water he turneth it whithersoever he will, Prov. 21. 1.* I suppose the King of Kings, in his providential Care for Mankind, has a more particular regard to Princes, to direct them in their Counsels, and Administration of Justice. But Kings may be forsaken as well as other Men, and are not wont to be converted by a Miracle. Several Kings of *Israel* fell into Idolatry; *Omri* established it by Law, and *Ahab* persisted in it. Now the People were not excused for their compliance; nor were they allowed to expect the Conversion of their Princes. They ought to have prevented the setting up of False Gods, and were punish'd because they did not. *Thou shalt*

(3)

shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap, &c. For the Statutes of Omri are kept, and all the Works of the house of Ahab, and ye walk in their Counsels, that I should make thee a Desolation, Mich. 6. 15, 16. If Solomon's words were to be practiced in the utmost latitude, *Where the Word of a King is, there is Power*; then *Mahometism*, *Heathenism*, or *Popery* might be set up, when a *King* is so ill-inclin'd; this is not impossible, and the other wou'd be very easy; a few *Women* might do the Work by the *King's Commission*; for none ought to resist them: Then *Absolute Passive Obedience* wou'd be a greater Load than *Circumcision*; the *Pope's Nuncio* and *Father Peters*, like *Simeon* and *Levi*, might have made a *Parisian* or *Irish Massacre*. Nature teaches, that this ought not to be suffer'd, and a *Standing Army* then was thought more effectual. But this is not a *Power*, that properly belongs to the *King*, when there is no other occasion for it; this is not the *Power*, that is *Ordain'd of God*. There is no *Divine Commission* for an *Army*, but what the *Law of Nature* gives, for a necessary Defence. I say then, to resist such a Force is not *resisting the King*, but an *illegal Power*, that does not belong to him; it is the saving of Men's Lives, which certainly belong to them; it is the preserving of *Religion*, which belongs to God. And I think it is well, if we render to *Cesar*, the things that are *Cesar's*, and to *God*, the things that are *God's*.

Therefore it is not equitable, to condemn the People of *England*, because they have prevented the

the Establishment of Popery, and the Effusion of much Blood. But it is objected against us, They have set up Kings, but not by me, Hosea, 8. 4. I suppose these words cannot be applied to any other Nation but the Jews, who were under God's particular direction, and had his Prophets to consult, as they ought to have done upon any great Occasion. But other Nations, or Mankind in general, have been left to themselves, to follow the Law of Self preservation, and to form Governments, as Reason and Experience suggests to them.

There is indeed an over-ruling Providence, by which God has sometimes set up Kings, and sometimes pulled down others, working great Deliverances. In which cases, Men being the Instruments, and the Providence of God concurring with the Necessities of Men, *They* may be rather said to set up Kings by him, than otherwise. For we have now no new Revelations, altho' God still Ruleth in the World; but what God did in that Kingdom, by an extraordinary discovery of his Will, he does the same now by ordinary means, and what his Prophets were to them, his Providence is now to us. So that there seems to be some reason to think, that a Prince advanced by remarkable Providences, is as much, (and more immediately) ordain'd of God, as one claiming by Hereditary-Right. Besides it cannot be prov'd, that Royal Power is only a Divine Institution, and has continu'd in a direct Line from the beginning, which is absolutely necessary, and ought to be very clear, to serve the purpose of our
Adver-

Adversaries; but the contrary may be better demonstrated, which I shall endeavour, according to my present Ability.

But I shall First observe, That God sometimes sends wicked Princes for the punishment of Sin, sometimes sets them up by Conquest, and some say our Kings derive their Right from William the Conquerour. God may indeed permit an Evil Ruler for a Time, or a Conquest with its Disadvantages; but this is not intended, any more than God's displeasure, to continue for ever; There may be a time to Rejoyce, as well as to Mourn. Nor is it a foundation of an *unalterable Right*, or of *absolute Dominion*. Certainly a People may throw off a Yoak imposed upon them, without any Offence to God, as soon as they have an Opportunity, and ought to look upon that Opportunity as sent by him. A single Person taken Captive, is not bound in conscience to be a *Slave*, much less a Nation. Government was intended for good, not to enslave Mankind, who are by Nature *Free*, and no farther bound than they themselves have consented to. Men have indeed consented and bound themselves, to prevent *Slavery* and *Ruin*, and this without doubt was the *Original* of Government.

St. Peter saith, *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake; whether it be the King as Supreme*, 1 Pet. 2. 13.

I cannot imagin, how these Words can be understood otherwise, than that Government was of Man's Invention; but Men will Strain hard for *profit*, and flattery will go far. The
natural

natural sense and meaning of the *Greek Words*, ἀνθρώπων κτίσις, is Human Ordinance or Creation. It is the very same Word (κτίσις), that St. Paul hath, where he speaks of God's Creation, ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου, *from the Creation of the World*, Rom. 1. 20. Likewise St. John in the Revelations, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, *the beginning of the Creation of God*, Rev. 3. 14.

It is in the same Sense that the *Latins* say *Create Magistratum, Cæs.* Those Roman Emperors to which St. Paul commanded Subjection, had no other Title, than what the *Roman Senate*, or the *Army*, gave them. If Truth only had declared a King to be *Jure Divino*, there had been no need of Fictions to establish an absolute Authority, as *Alexander* pretended to be the Son of *Jupiter Ammon*, thereby to aggrandize himself.

We have many Examples of Princes being sensible, that they were not only Men, but as Kings, were the *Ordinance of Men*; upon which account they have been cautious not to impose hard things upon their People, and have thought themselves not only obliged to consent to wholesome Laws, but also to preserve them, not to set them aside at pleasure. ' The Kings of *Persia* were as absolute as most Princes, yet when ' the Presidents, Governours, Princes and Coun- ' cellors consulted together to establish a Law, ' and the King had signed it, then that Law was ' unalterable, the King himself could not break ' it, tho' he very much desir'd it.' Where Kings have made Laws alone, we do not find by
any

any Presidents, that they alone have abrogated them, or have not themselves been bound by them.

It is but of late Years, that we have heard of that Novel Doctrine of *Divine Right*. Princes have claim'd the Crown as their Right, and it might be allowed; but this Right descended from some Legal Settlement, as well as other Forms of Government. Some Kings of *England* have accepted the Crown as the Gift of the People. But it must needs be otherwise understood, because St. Paul says, *the Powers that be are ordained of God*; which disagrees with St. Peter. Now I think they may be as well reconciled, as St. Paul and St. James, when the one says, *We are justified by Faith without the Deeds of the Law*; and the other says, *We are justified by Works, and not by Faith only*: For both these Propositions are true in divers respects, and so are the other. We are the Sons of Men, and yet God is our Father: So is Government the Ordinance of God, and also the Ordinance of Man. How can that be? By the Law of Nature, and by God's Approbation, or Establishment of that Human Invention. It is a Divine Appointment of an Human Ordinance, or an *Human Ordinance* with a *Divine Sanction*.

I do not know of any particular Instructions that God hath given to Men, upon which Government was at first invented: But the Divine Appointment is included in the Law of Nature, and the Confirmation of God's Word. Now the Law of Nature, with respect to Government,

is a Power in the Reasonable Nature, to use proper Means for its Preservation. For as God hath given to Creatures without Reason, a sagacious Instinct, whereby they have admirable ways to save themselves from Harm : So by the noble Faculty of Reason, he hath sufficiently qualify'd Man, without any need of Revelation, to provide for his own Safety. Government being the Product of Reason, and Experience, may be called a Divine Ordinance, because it is the most Divine Issue of the Law of Nature, whereof God is the Author ; and the Ruler is God's Vicegerent, because he doth the Work of God, Justice and Judgment. Government is again a Divine Ordinance, because God hath approved, confirmed, and established, what the Reason of Mankind hath done in that particular.

Grotius accounts this latter reason sufficient, and it is all he gives to reconcile the Apostles.

‘ *Notandum est, primo homines, non Dei præcepto,*
 ‘ *sed sponte adductos, experimento segregum ad-*
 ‘ *versus violentium in Societate Civilem coisse ;*
 ‘ *unde ortum habet potestas civilis, quam ideo hu-*
 ‘ *manam Ordinationem Petrus vocat, quamquam*
 ‘ *a Paulo Divina Ordinatio vocatur, quia hominum*
 ‘ *Salubre Institutum Deus probavit.* Gro. Lib. 1.
 ‘ c. 4.

The learned Puffendorf assigns two Reasons of Mens entering into Civil Society. First, Differences and Disputes arising among Neighbours, and no body having Authority to decide them. 2dly, The Conspiracies of ill Men to rob and plunder

plunder, and no Power in being to protect the Innocent, or to correct Offenders. For, *says he*,
 ‘ when Quarrels and Controversies did arise (one
 ‘ Master of a Family having as much Authority
 ‘ as another) there was no way to determine them
 ‘ but by Force, which brought great Mischief and
 ‘ Inconvenience. And when a *publick Robber* set
 up for himself, it was not in the power of single Families to resist him. Hereupon entring into mutual Society to defend themselves against a common Enemy, it might seem very advisable to commit the Conduct and Administration of the *Whole* to some *One Man*, who seem’d most remarkable for his *Activity* and *Prudence*.
Puff. Hist. of Europe, p. 1, 2.

To which I shall add, the Judgment of the famous and judicious Mr. *Hooker*. This learned Man was wont in time past to be much admir’d by our best Churchmen, tho’ he was a great *Whig*, according to some Mens Notions now-a-days. ‘ All publick Regimen (*says he*) of
 ‘ what kind soever, seemeth evidently to have
 ‘ risen from the deliberate Advice, Consultation and Composition of Men, judging it convenient and behoveful.

So that for some time, as *Puffendorf* observes, *there was no King in the World*; but they were at first chosen by the People, for their Convenience, not dropt out of the Clouds to prey upon and devour Mankind. This was however before the *Holy Scripture* was written; and tho’ it came by Consultation of Men, yet *Government* is a *Divine Ordinance*, as proceeding from

the *Law of Nature*, and afterwards confirmed by the *Word of God*.

When therefore the People have committed their Concerns to *One Person*, and have made the Throne an Inheritance to his Family, it cannot be supposed to be done without Reserve ; and when good Laws have been made upon farther Experience, they comprehend an Authority to preserve them. For whatsoever Right there is to make Laws, there is the same Right to defend them, tho' it be not expressed. God having declar'd his Good-will to Mankind, it cannot be supposed, that what Methods Natural Reason had put Men upon for their Preservation, should be defeated by a Divine Appointment ; no more than we can suppose, that Men had not a better Capacity than the Instinct of Brutes, to provide for their own Safety.

Nor doth it any where appear, or can be proved, that any revealed Law hath contradicted the great Law of Nature, *Self-preservation* : But that on the contrary, Men are bound in Duty to preserve their *Lives* and the *Common Good of Society*, as much as in them lies. In respect of particular Persons, it may be set aside for the *Common Good*, as when Men expose themselves in War ; and when the Honour of God is immediately concern'd, as in the Case of the primitive Christians, when the Law was against them ; Then, I say, the Law of Self-preservation ought to be set aside, because God is above every Law. We ought rather to dye,
than

than deny him, or his Christ. Otherwise the Law of Self-preservation and the Laws of the Country take place. St. *Paul*, tho' he was ready to dye for the Name of *Jesus*, yet did not think he ought to be smitten contrary to the Law, and therefore invents a Stratagem to save himself, *Acts* 23. More especially on a general account, it is a stated Maxim, that *Salus Populi est Suprema Lex*; *The common Safety is the Sovereign Law*. But when the Law of Nature and Religion are united by particular Laws, there seems to be still greater reason to defend both the Honour of God, and the Lives of the People.

Now all Civil Laws are founded on the Law of Nature for the Preservation of Mankind, which is the Ordinance of God; and therefore the most Legal Government is in the highest degree, the Ordinance of God. In this *Vox Populi Vox Dei*, it is this that appoints a fit Person to Rule, and He is called, as I said before, *God's Vicegerent*, because he in God's stead, executes Justice, and protects his People.

It is by the Law of Nature, that *whoſo ſheds Man's Blood, by Man ſhall his Blood be ſhed*. When there was no other Law, nor any Government in the World, *Cain* feared that every Man, or any Man ſhould ſlay him, becauſe then every Man had a right to ſlay a Murderer. But Experience hath found out a better Method to execute Juſtice in a Legal manner, and to aſſiſt the Law of Nature by particular Laws. The beſt

best way we believe to be by a *Kingly Government*, and justly value our Own *Constitution*.

When God gave to *Noah* that Law against Murder, (which Law I suppose to have been before a Law of Nature, being necessary to Man's Preservation, and confirmed to *Noah* for that end) it does not appear, that there was then any Magistracy, or Method prescrib'd, how it ought to be done, but that seems to be left to the *Reason* and *Experience* of Mankind. We do not find in Scripture, how or where Government began, nor is there any way to trace the Descent of Princes in a direct *Line*, nay, it is impossible, there is no such thing as a *direct Line* from the beginning.

If *Adam* had executed the Office of a Magistrate, *Cain* had been in greater Danger at home than abroad. The first we read of was *Nimrod*, who pretended to a sort of Government. The Text says, he began to be a Mighty One in the Earth, and the beginning of his Kingdom was *Babel*. He was Grandson to *Ham*, *Noah's* second Son. I suppose no Man will say his Government was lawful, nor would, if they could, derive a Succession from him, who was a *Tyrant* and a *Robber*, not of the *Eldest* Branch, not approved by the People, but joyn'd by Men of like Principles, whose Design was to live upon Plunder. Now, if it had been necessary, (I speak with Submission) here would have been a fair Occasion to mention, who ought to have been *King*, or who was the *King*, if there was any then Regnant ; but the Silence of the Scripture

ture in this great Affair, imports, that it belonged to Men to take Care of themselves ; and as *Puffendorf*, *Grotius*, *Hooker*, and other Learned Men agree, The Original of Government was by Consultation, and that the *best* Title to Sovereignty, was the Consent of the *People*, grounded upon the Law of *Self-preservation*. Perhaps they were taught by *Nimrod* and other *Ruffians*, to put it in Practice ; but whilst they neglected it, no doubt they suffer'd by their Indolence. It may be, the want of Government was one great Occasion of so much Wickedness before the Deluge ; and it was the Peoples own Fault to make no better use of their Reason, but carelessly to neglect a Matter of so great Importance.

I shall here translate what I quoted before out of *Grotius*, viz. ' It is to be observed, That
' at first Men, not by God's Command, but
' moved by Experience of the Impotence of separate Families to resist Violence, did of their
' own accord unite in *Civil Society*, whence *Civil*
' *Power* took its beginning, which therefore *Sr.*
' *Peter* calls the Ordinance of Man ; altho' by
' *St. Paul* it is call'd the Ordinance of God, because God approved that wholesome Institution of Men. *The same Author saith*, ' Where
' a People have conferr'd not an *Absolute Power*,
' but a *Government* according to *Law*, they
' must be supposed to have reserved to themselves a Power necessary to preserve those
' *Laws*.

But

But there is a Difficulty, how any thing can be done against the Prince's Mind, or without him, when he designs to subvert the Government.

Surely in Cases of Extremity, if Mens Eyes are open, the *States* can assemble without the Formality of a *Writ*, when the *Substance*, nay, your ALL lies at Stake? It is not the Design of a *Society* to fall upon its own *Sword*.

I favour not *Antimonarchical* or *Rebellious Principles*, but such as make the *King* and *Nation* happy; true *British Monarchical Principles*, which make the *best* Subjects to the *best* of Princes, his present Majesty King *GEORGE*. Nor can any People out-do us in the performance of our Duty, in *Love* and *Honour* to the true and faithful *Defender of our Faith* and *Civil Rights*.

Those that say *Kings* derive their *Power* from *God* immediately, without the *Law of Nature*, cannot prove it by any Examples, except in some extraordinary Cases; and even then, the *Peoples* Consent was requir'd, as in the Election of *Saul* and *David*.

But they urge, That the People have nothing to do in the Matter, because they cannot give a Power to another, which they have not in themselves; For, *say they*, a Man hath not power over his own Life, to destroy it; therefore Men cannot give to another the Power of *Life* and *Death*.

This is a weak Argument, and may be answer'd out of what I said before, *viz.* That Self-

Self-murder is a Breach of the *Law of Nature*, as being contrary to Self-preservation ; but to punish Judicially, is the Execution of the Law of Nature : And for the same Reason that no Man hath power over himself to destroy himself, a *Community* may give power to execute Justice upon Offenders, because this is for the Preservation of the Body, or whole Community. It is the same thing in a Natural Body ; any Person may cut off, or authorize another to cut off a Limb, that would corrupt or destroy the Body : So may a Community give power to some *fit* Person to cut off a Criminal, who is no more to that Community, than a Joynt of the least Finger is to the whole Body Natural.

It is hereby manifest, That a *Legal* Government, as proceeding from, and founded on the Law of Nature, is the Ordinance of God, which ought to be submitted to, not *Illegal* Violence : That a Community hath a Right to preserve it self, and the Laws that support it : That the *Royal Prerogative* and the *Rights* of the *People*, may consist and be united, the better to support and defend each other : That the *Legislature* hath a Sufficient and *Legal Power* to do what is necessary to preserve the Constitution, that is, The *Life of the Body Politick*. That therefore King George has the best Title to these Kingdoms in the late *Act of Settlement*, being founded on his *Hereditary* Right, and the utmost Necessity of *State*. But if the Prince be *All in All*, and his Subjects no Right to *Life, Liberty, or Estate*, but what is derived from Him, and depends

D

upon

upon his Pleasure, which is made the Consequence of a *Divine Right*, without any thing of *Human Ordinance*; then it will follow, *That the People were made for the King, not the King for the People*, which is contrary both to Scripture and Reason. For according to the High Notion, when St. Paul founded Obedience, according to Divine Goodness, upon this Reason, *That Rulers are Ministers for Good*; we might rather have expected he would have said, *Be ye subject to the Higher Powers*, &c. for the People are the King's Servants, made for his Convenience, to do his Pleasure, and advance his Grandeur. Let the King do what Mischief he will, *who may say unto him, what doest thou?* Whereas on the contrary, all the Apostle's Argument, all the Reason of Submission, all the Sanction of Authority, hangs upon this Point, *He is the Minister of God unto thee for Good*.

But *He* is bound in Conscience, and takes an Oath, to act for the Good of his People. But this is not always a sufficient Security, as we have found by Experience, against any Opinion he may espouse, contrary to the *Laws* and *Interest*, yea, against the *Lives* of his Subjects. The High Notion it self is enough to mislead him, into all the Mischief of *Ambition* and *Flattery*: It will perswade him, that *Laws* are an Imposition, that an Oath is forced, and that he will never be call'd to an Account, nor Answer hereafter, for throwing off or breaking through every thing, that puts a Restraint upon his Will. He will be apt to think, that what he pleases or judges

judges best, is for the Peoples Good. I do not say, that Subjects may *call* their Prince to an Account, or do any Violence to his Person, which I allow to be *Sacred* ; but certainly they may remonstrate, and when nothing else will prevail, defend themselves, as *David* did against *Saul*, and preserve the *legal Government*.

I abhor the *Rebellion* of 41, but vindicate the late *Revolution* ; for there is no Comparison between them. In the former, the King made great Concessions, and pardon'd rebellious Acts. In the latter, the most humble Remonstrances were accounted treasonable *Libels* ; for Instance, The Petition of Seven *Bishops*, for which they were imprison'd, and try'd like *Criminals*. In a word, all gentle Methods were ineffectual ; it was not easy to stop the Torrent ; and I think it sufficient Satisfaction, that when this *Nation* took such a Course as NECESSITY oblig'd them to, to preserve the Constitution in *Church* and *State*, the late King *James* went off, as it were to seek new Force, and left the *Community* to *secure* and *provide* for it *self* in the best manner, which it hath done in the late *Revolution* and *Protestant Succession*.

But farther ; some learned Men affirm, That *Henry VII.* King of *England*, had no other than a *Parliamentary Right* to the Crown ; all the Claim he could pretend to, was from a Daughter of the House of *Lancaster*, which was a younger Branch than the House of *York*. However, he did not insist on that Claim, but depended on an Act of Parliament, which he pro-

tured to settle the Crown upon himself and his Family. He was not so near to the Crown as the late King *William*, nor had cause to suspect an Imposture, to deprive him of the Succession, as King *William* had : But he was acknowledg'd much in the same manner, and afterwards confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*.

From this Settlement came in the Family of *Stuarts*, by a Daughter married to K. *James* the 4th of *Scotland*. *Henry* indeed, after this Settlement, married the Eldest Daughter of *Edward* the 4th, by which Marriage the House of *York* and *Lancaster* were united ; but then he had not only taken up Arms, and removed another King, but there was a *Male-Heir* of the House of *York*, viz. the Earl of *Warwick*, who liv'd twenty Years in this King's Reign, was most of that time imprison'd, and afterwards executed by him.

So that the Family of *Stuart* was obliged to one *Act of Settlement*, made by a King who had *less Right*, and was advanced upon much *less Reason*, than the late King *William*. But King *George*, being of the same Family, has a Title confirmed by many Acts of Parliament in two successive Reigns.

There have been several Changes in all Nations ; in ours, none so *just* as the late *Revolution*. Yet when Kings were accepted and acknowledged by the *States*, tho' their *Titles* were not immediately or directly *Lineal*, the Laws made in those Reigns were nevertheless *good*, and did always remain in *force*, till for some after-

after-reason repeal'd. Such were the Laws made by the Kings of the House of *Lancaster*, *Richard* the 3d, and *Henry* the 7th, who had no Lineal Right when those Laws were made ; tho' some of them indeed made a way to that Right, (which they had better wanted) by cutting off the *Lineal Branches* of the *Royal Family*. So did *Richard* the 3d, who was a notorious *Usurper*, and *Murderer* of the *Royal Family*. The better part of his Character is in *Mr. Collier's* Words : ' That he procur'd many good Laws ' for the Ease of his People, and omitted nothing that might tend to the Honour of the ' *English Nation*.

Whatsoever the Prince was, it was the *Common Good* which determin'd Laws, either to be *contin'd*, *repeal'd*, or *alter'd*. When once a Law was made by the King in *Possession*, and the Consent of the States, nothing could make it void, till it was cancell'd by the same or an equal Authority ; nothing could impair its Virtue, till by farther Experience it was found *inconvenient* or *useless* to the Publick.

But as Men are not infallible, so sometimes Laws have been procur'd by *ill* Means, and made for *ill* Purposes, which is a Fault, and ought to be avoided. Such was that Law in behalf of *Richard* the Third, to fix him in the Throne, and deprive the true *Heir*, without any just Cause. Nevertheless he was a King, and his Laws were *valid*. How much rather were our late Glorious Deliverers King *William* and Queen *Mary* to be acknowledg'd upon a Vacancy,

eancy, and to be confirmed by Law, to perfect so great a Deliverance? How much better were those Laws, which establish the *Protestant Succession*, and are the *Bulwark* of the Reformation?

Sometimes a Law may prove prejudicial or inconvenient to the State, upon some Occasions or Events, which could not be foreseen; yet such Laws oblige so long as they are Laws. Our late *Triennial Act* was thought to be a good Law, and a great Advantage gain'd by the *Subject*; but it hath proved otherwise on some accounts; and perhaps it would be pernicious at this Juncture, because our Enemies might gain Ground by a Dissolution of the present Parliament. This Act was pass'd by King *William*, but contrary to his Opinion and Inclination, not so much because it was a Diminution of the *Prerogative*, as because he foresaw the Disadvantage of it to the *Subject*.

Now those very Men, who were once full of the *Prerogative*, account this *Triennial Act* a good Law, and call this *New Law* a Part of our Constitution, which they have been endeavouring to destroy. They would not allow it to be alter'd in point of Time only, and will have it to be a good Law still, when it is alter'd by the present *Legislature*, altho it was Enacted by King *William*, whom they would not own to be King *de jure*. Yet they declare against the Act of Settlement, which was made by the same Prince, and was the greatest Glory of that Illustrious Prince's Reign, who sacrific'd his *Own* Quiet, for the *Good* of his People. But

But how much rather ought this to be and continue a Law for ever, when nothing is more certain in this World, than the perpetual Benefit of it to this Nation? And how inconsistent are the Notions of Men, who give themselves up to unreasonable Prejudices, and would have nothing *Good*, but what serves to their *Evil* Purposes?

I desire them to consider, that the Holy Scripture doth not contradict or forbid the reasonable and necessary Measures that Men take for their Preservation. The *Good* of Mankind even in this World is a main Design of those Holy Writings, and of God's Commands in particular. Nor doth the Scripture determine the Rights of Princes, nor the Measures of their Government, but allows the Customs of Nations; and the Practices of our Nation, and many others, agree in this, That altho' the Prince's Title is defective in point of *Lineal Descent*, yet the Laws made by him are not the less obligatory. If this Rule holds in any Case, certainly it must in Cases of the greatest Consequence: Such as our late *Act of Settlement*, &c. And why might not this Nation exclude *Papists* from the Succession by Law, as well as the *French* exclude *Women* from their Crown by the *Salique Law*.

Therefore, if those Laws, which are not good in themselves, are observ'd till repeal'd; if those Laws have no less Authority, and are in force at this Day, tho' enacted by a Prince who had much less of *Hereditary Right* than that of the late King *William* and Queen *Mary*, under the
most

most disadvantageous Representation ; if Men have any Power to make Laws, if the chief end of Laws be the *Common Good* ; certainly, most *Legal* and *Binding* is the late Act of *Settlement*, being made upon so long consideration and experience, for the Safety of the Nation, and to frustrate our restless Enemies ; certainly, most *necessary* and *just* is that Law, which secures our *Holy Religion*, and excludes *Idolatry* and *Arbitrary Power*.

On the other hand, all Laws whatsoever in *England* are alterable by the *same* Authority that made them, They are liable to stand or fall, as the *Good* or *Ill* effects of them become visible: As it is in less, so it is in greater Concerns, because the chief end of *Publick Acts* is the *Publick Good*. To this end Kings were chosen at first by *Common Consent*, and they are *Ministers of God to us for Good*. To this end afterwards Laws were made to settle an *Hereditary Right* in one Family, and other Laws were made from time to time on particular occasions for the *Publick Good*.

It does not then seem reasonable, that the Law of *Hereditary Right*, should devour all other Laws, or that the *Interest* or *Pleasure* of one Person shou'd destroy the *Common Good*, because we must be *Subject* to the *Higher Powers*. No, it is rather implied in the General Rule of Obedience, as well as in the Oath of Allegiance, That the *Publick Good* may be secured, and that *Self Defence* is no *Criminal Resistance*.

We ought not to be given to Change, nor act *Factionously* or *Rebellionously*, nor for inferiour *Causes*; but when there is any such unhappy Occasion, which we ought to wish may never be, the management ought to be the most *Prudent* and *Moderate* that Cases of Extremity will admit of. On such occasions certainly, the End of Laws and Government being considered, the Law of *Hereditary Right* is not *unchangable*, but may be *explained*, *limited* or *qualified* by another succeeding Law, or Laws, as we find it declared by an Act of Q. *Eliz.* of blessed Memory, which shall be mentioned hereafter.

It was a Parliamentary Settlement, that first entail'd the Crown, and the same Authority, which still subsists, can break the *Entail*, and qualify the *Succession*. Indeed if an Act of Parliament were like the Laws of the *Medes* and *Persians*, which alter not, then the *Right* of *Inheritance* once settled, could *never* be removed nor transferr'd; It was one of those *unalterable Laws* that cast *Daniel* into the Lions Den, contrary to the Will of one of the most absolute Princes, and if the Right of Succession had been such, *England* had ere this been one great Den of *Lions*, or at least a Reigon of *Devouring Beasts*.

But Providence has provided better for us, I hope we may give thanks for it, and indeed, one would think, some room might be left for *Divine Providence*, to interpose in Extremities, and to assist the necessary endeavours of Men for their *Preservation*. When therefore the

King of Kings, the great *Preserver of Men*, sets up Princes and works Deliverances, not by Miracles (which we expect not now) but by ordinary Means; is it hard if the Instruments can never be unblameable, Are not they rather to be blamed, whose devices and designs are to pull down HIM, whom God hath exalted.

The Succession of *England* from *William* the Conqueror to *Henry* the 7th, hath varied from a direct Line more then ten times, I do not say always upon just Reasons. Two of them were immediately after the Conquest, the States having preferr'd two Younger Brothers before the Eldest, by which means they shook off some hard Conditions, that the Conquerour had impos'd upon them. So uncertain is an exact Hereditary Title, And as in those days a Parliamentary Settlement was thought the best and most certain Title; so it ought to be accounted Now, especially, if the Common Good be considered, There ought to be a great regard had to the Hereditary Right of Princes, but the PEOPLE also have their Hereditary Rights; they have their Vineyards which ought not to be given away from their Posterity. Certainly the common Safety will balance the supposed Right of a single Person; and another of the same Family, more Fit and Worthy, must turn the Scale. This must be granted, if Mankind had any share in the Invention of Government, or ever any Liberty to dispose of themselves, or any Power to consult for their own Safety, which I think is absurd to deny.

Ever

Ever since the *Reformation*: there was need of a Law, to Exclude *Papists* from the Succession in these Kingdoms, and it hath been but of late happily effected; Nothing could be more necessary: For, as the Apostle speaks in a like Case, *The Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law*, Heb. 7. 12.

The necessity of such a change is still the greater, because our Government cannot consist without it, so malignant are *Popish* Principles, that a Prince of that Profession cannot be bound to protect a *Protestant Society*, but he is obliged to the contrary; altho' he breaks all *Oaths* and the most Solemn Promises. For he believes, *No Faith is to be kept with Hereticks*, and that he shall be called to no Account, but attain to a high degree of *Merit*, if he can extirpate *Heresy* and propagate his *Own Religion*, Whilst we believe, that, according to Primitive Christianity, *after the way, which they call Heresy, so Worship We the God of our Fathers*.

Now the Law above mentioned, (by which alone under Divine Providence we are fortified against those pernicious Principles,) has a foundation in an Act of Queen *Elizabeth*, of blessed Memory, importing, ' That the *Queen* with
' and by the Authority of the Parliament is able
' to make *Laws* and *Statutes* of sufficient Force
' and *validity* to limit and bind the Crown of
' this Realm, and the *Descent* and *Inheritance*
' thereof. By which Clause it is apparent, that the Crown of *England* has not descended by a Divine Entail, as that of *Judea*, in the

Family of *David*. No it was a *Parliamentary Settlement* that first entail'd the Crown of *England*.

The Parliament, in that Queen's Reign, frequently solicited and earnestly desired her to provide for the *Succession*; altho' Queen *Mary* of *Scotland*, Grand-child to *Henry 7th*, King of *England* was next Heir to Queen *Elizabeth*, but as her self pretended, before Q. *Elizabeth*, taking the Title and Arms of *England*, as soon as Queen *Mary* of *England* was dead: At which Queen *Elizabeth* being highly disgusted, and suspecting Queen *Mary's* Designs when she fled into *England*, kept her in Custody all her Life. After many solicitations, Q. E. offer'd to release her upon certain conditions agreed on in Council, whereof the Sixth Article was, ' *That she would not, during the Life of Queen Elizabeth, claim any Right or Title to the Kingdom of England, and after her death, submit and refer the Right of Succession to the Judgment of the Estates.* At the same time reigned in *Scotland* King *James* the Sixth, Son of the aforesaid Queen *Mary*, who was afterwards King of *England*. According to this and many other Precedents, the Parliament hath a legal Authority and sufficient Power to Limit or Determine the *Succession*, in dubious Cases, or when there is any eminent or apparent Danger to the Publick, either in Church or State, or both.

Accordingly, the *Succession* has been limited to the *Protestant* Branches of the *Royal Family*.

And

And this Succession has been confirm'd by several Laws, acknowledged by other Princes and signally vindicated by *Divine Providence*. So that His Majesty *King George* has the *best* Title to these Kingdoms by Law, and the *first Hereditary Right* above and before any Person, that is capable to Govern these Nations.

His present Majesty having so just a Title to the Crown, the *Supremacy* both in *Church* and *State* by consequence belongs to him, and if it were necessary, the Parliament might as well give or renew that Title to him, as the same Authority gave it at first to *King Henry* the Eighth, who was the first in *England*, that had the Title of *Supreme Head* of the Church. He did not claim it, as any other way due to him, but in the Year 1535. ' was made an Act of Parliament, ' which authoriz'd the King to be *Supreme* ' *Head of the Church of England*, and the *Pope's* ' Authority to be utterly abolished.

How absurd then is our *New Doctrine*, which will not allow us to *Pray* for our *Lawful King*, and upon that account wou'd rob the Church of its very *Being*? Abominable Treachery! which wou'd either blow up the Church or Bury her in Obscurity. They say we are *Schismatical*, *Excommunicated*, as bad as *Hereticks*, that the *Church of England* is now no *Church*, because we pray for His Sacred Majesty *King George*, and two or three Bishops have been deprived; but the Nonjurors are the true Church. Intolerable Nonsense!

However

However our Case were, supposing we were guilty of an *Errour in Civil Government*, the contrary of which I think has been demonstrated; it is absurd to imagine, that the *Being* of a *true Church* should depend upon the *State*, which is subject to Changes; that all Things are changeable, except a *Bishops Sea* which is unchangeable. Certainly the Government can displace *Bishops*, else the *Church* is above the *State*; and tho' they remain *Bishops* still, yet they are as it were dead in Law; and other Persons are no less *Bishops*, who are consecrated by the same *Order*.

It is only upon a Reason of State, that Princes have the Nomination: The Consecration is the same, the Church remains the same. Can one little Circumstance make them and the Body of the Church *Schismatical*? This is to set the Nomination above the *Institution*, and the Prince above our Saviour. In like manner to say, That by the Second Canon of the Church, Christians are Excommunicated in such Cases, is as much as to say, that the Canon can limit Divine Providence, and so determine *Affairs*, that the Succession can never be altered. This puts the Church under a necessity, to contend against Heaven, to be divided against it self, to devour one another and to speak evil of *Dignities*. Whereas it is our Duty, *as much as in us lies, to live peaceably with all Men*. It is our Duty to pray for all men, for Kings and all that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all Godliness and honesty, 1 Tim. 2. 2. This we are commanded to do, but

but not to ask how they came by that *Authority*. Now, because we have left undone those things, which we ought not to have done, and done those things, which we ought to have done. We must *all* be excommunicated, Can the *Church* excommunicate it self, and all the *Bishops* be Excommunicated at one Blow? I rather think the *Bishops* may make a *New Canon*, than to be so maul'd with an *Old One*.

But there is no need of that, The *Canon* may be better understood, viz. of the *King's Majesty* now reigning and whosoever shall be in the same *Authority*, may it be His Majesties *Issue* for ever. The *Canon* saith.

Whosoever hereafter shall affirm, that the King's Majesty hath not the same Authority in Causes Ecclesiastical, that the Godly Kings had amongst the Jews and Christian Emperours of the Primitive Church, or impeach any part of the Regal Supremacy; Let him be excommunicated ipso facto, and not be restored, but only by the Arch-Bishop, after his repentance and publick revocation of those his wicked Errours.

From whence we may observe, first, That according to this *Canon*, the *Kings Supremacy* is not to be deny'd, and that the present *King of England*, has the same *Authority in Cases Ecclesiastical*; that the *Godly Kings* had amongst the *Jews, &c.* This *Authority* extends to deposing even of the *High-Priest*; and this is a main Point, which our Adversaries will not allow, and have made so much noise about, particularly *Dr. Hicks*, who asserts, That a *Bishop* cannot

cannot be deprived. But we find that the *High Priest Abiathar* was actually deprived by King *Solomon*, and confin'd to his Country House. Mr. Collier says, ' *Zadock* was a High Priest of the *Jews*, the Successor of *Abiathar*, who was deprived of that Dignity by *Solomon* for siding with *Adonijah*. This is parallel to our Case, and shews how Men may differ in opinion, but must submit to the Government. For *Adonijah* was *David's* Eldest Son, upon which account he had a pretence to claim the Crown, and *Abiathar* to favour his Cause; yet *Solomon* accounted him worthy of death, but spares his life, because he had been serviceable to his Father *David*, 1 Kings 2. 26. So *Solomon* thrust out *Abiathar* from being Priest unto the Lord, that he might fulfil the word of the Lord concerning the house of *Eli* in *Shiloh*, v. 27. Altho' the Prophecy was to be fulfill'd some way or other; yet it was only a Civil Cause, that gave occasion to it in the Person of *Abiathar*, after he had long executed the Office of *High Priest*, and he is called a *High Priest* still, after he is deprived of the Office. *Zadock* and *Abiathar* were *High Priests*, 1 Kings 4. 4. See the Commentator. We may here also take Notice, that tho' it was foretold that *Solomon* should succeed *David*, yet his Succession did wholly depend on *David's* appointment and Will, 1 Kings 1. 17 30. &c. And I suppose the same thing may be done by a King of England and his Parliament, especially upon such Reasons as have been of late amongst us.

To

To come to the New Testament. If the Prince's Nomination of Bishops is essential to the Being of a True Church, we might have expected that *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate* wou'd have been concern'd in it.

But I suppose, that no Princes were at all concern'd in that Matter, nor was it necessary, till the *Church* and *State* were bound up together, and then, as I said before, the King might claim the *Supremacy*, upon a *Politick Account*, and the Church allow it for the same Reason. The *Pope* has long usurp'd that Power, and why, was the Church no worse for that, if the Prince's *Right* was indispensable. If it belong'd to the *Pope*, how would the Property be alter'd? But that *Power* was transferr'd to King *Hen. VIII.* by Act of Parliament; sent again beyond the *Alps* by Queen *Mary*, and restor'd to Queen *Elizabeth* by Act of Parliament; at which time 14 *Bishops*, and other *Ecclesiasticks*, refus'd to take the *Oath* of *Supremacy*, and were deprived for that Reason only. Certainly the Being of a true Church cannot depend upon a Power so changeable; and none but *Papists* heretofore did say the *Church* of *England* was *Schismatical*.

If the *Supremacy* could be transferr'd, it might to the late King *William*, and never was there so great Reason for it: Now the Church is said to be Excommunicated for Compliance with this Change so necessary, that it had been no Church without it.

The Second *Canon* does only acknowledge the King's *Supremacy*, and vindicate it by her *Censure*,

but cannot determine the Succession, nor make the Being of the Church depend upon it. If a Change in the State, or the Deprivation of 3 or 4 *Bishops* did so much affect the Church, we might have expected some Rule or Command about so important a Matter, because such an Assertion tends to infinite Divisions; but *Peace* and *Unity* are often commanded, and very much recommended in *Holy Scripture*; *If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all Men*, Rom. 12. 18.

This is the principal Thing, to which little Scruples or Things of less Moment should give Place: Certainly, we ought not to take away all possibility of *Living in Peace*, and to contend *not for the true Faith*, but for an impracticable *Notion*. St. Paul gives Advice quite contrary in a parallel Case, and we might as well expect his Advice or a Command on a *publick* as a *private* Account, if it had been necessary.

Christ and the *Church* are compar'd to a married State, the *Bond* whereof is *Sacred* to the utmost Degree; the Husband is the Head of the Wife, as *Christ* is the Head of the Church: The Prince is Head of the Church in a much inferior Respect, but the Husband is sole Head of the Wife; yet here is the *Apostle's* advice, *If the unbelieving depart, let him depart, a Brother or a Sister is not in Bondage in such Cases; but God hath called us to peace*, 1 Cor. 7. 15.

King *William* had Reason to believe, that a *Trick* was to be put upon him, to frustrate his *Succession*, as well as a *Toke* upon us, to ruin

our Posterity, yet he only design'd to set Things upon their right Bottom. But if K. *James* wou'd rather depart and Abdicate his Government ; how cou'd the *Church* help it ? What is it to the Church, but a blessing, that we may pray for King *GEORGE* and His *Royal Family*. Why shou'd not we pray for these Princes whom God hath Exalted by his Providence ? Unless it had been there forbidden, or expressly said you shall not pray for, nor acknowledge them as such.

And seeing allmighty God (in great Mercy to his People, the *British Nation*) hath sent a WISE and JUST King to Rule over us, and preserv'd to us a *Royal* and *Pious* Family, that is a present, and will be, a future blessing to US, our *Posterity* and *Nation*, why should we not *Sincerely* and *Heartily* pray for such an *inestimable Blessing*, and give all possible *Praise* to God. Hear what the *Psalmist* says, *Promotion cometh neither from the East, nor from the West, nor from the South. But God is the Judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another*, *Psal. 75. v. 6. 7.* And who shall say unto the Most High, what dost thou. What has the Church to do, but to pray for Kings and all that are in Authority ? Ay, but be sure you pray for the Right King, who is descended from *Adam* in the *Right Line*, of *Royal Blood*. Not a word of that, but pray for *Those* that are in *Authority*, that ye may lead a quiet and peaceable Life.

We may Observe 2ly. The Canon says not, *He is Excommunicated, but let him be, &c.* The

Canon it self Excommunicates none, but supposes it must be done in *Legal Form*, by a Person in *Authority*, and it is only meant of *single Persons* writing or speaking against the King's *Supremacy*. I do not find any Person to have been Excommunicated in any *Diocess*, no not by the *Pope* himself, upon this occasion. It cannot be done by this *Canon*. For K. *William* was, and K. *George* is that *Prince*, in whose behalf this *Canon* can now rightly be applyed: He is certainly *King of Great Britain*, and a *Member* of the *Church of England*. But how cou'd the late K. *James*, or any *Papist* be Head of that *Church*, whereof he is no *Member*? Or how can *Supremacy* belong to *Him*, who owns it to belong to *Another*? It is more probable, that the *Church of England* wanted a *Head* for almost four Years, which put her into so great *Convulsions*: And to be sure she had quite expir'd, if she had not been by a wonderful *Providence* preserv'd and *seasonably* delivered.

Therefore Mr. *Howel's* Assertion, that the *Revolutionists* and *Compliers* were excommunicated, proves him to be a *Jesuitical Incendiary*; for I cannot suppose him to be ignorant, that, no such thing has been, nor can be done. But let him look to himself; For the *Canon* is turn'd against him, and joyns with the *Statute Law* against every *Popish Pretender*.

I shall here add the Opinion of the late worthy *Arch-Bishop Sharp*, taken out of his Sermon preached at *St. Giles's* in the Fields, *London*, 1691. This learned Divine had then observ'd these

these Men, who are the true *Schismatics*, separating from the *Church*, because they were disaffected to the *Government*. I shall not repeat the whole, but the latter part of his discourse upon this Subject.

‘ But farther, I wish these Persons wou’d
 ‘ consider what an unaccountable humour it is,
 ‘ to make a *Rent* and *Schism* in the *Church*,
 ‘ upon a meer point of State. Great Revolu-
 ‘ tions have happen’d in all ages and in all
 ‘ Countries, and we have frequent instances of
 ‘ them in Story. But I believe it will not be
 ‘ easily found, that ever any Christians separa-
 ‘ ted from the *Church* upon account of them,
 ‘ Still they kept unanimously to their Doctrine
 ‘ and their Worship, and never concern’d them-
 ‘ selves farther in the turns of State (how great
 ‘ soever they were) than peaceably to submit to
 ‘ the *Powers in being*, and heartily to pray to God
 ‘ to prosper their Government, and direct all
 ‘ their Affairs, that all their Subjects might live
 ‘ quiet and peaceable Lives under them in all
 ‘ Godliness and Honesty.

‘ But when in a Revolution, a Prince was
 ‘ advanc’d to the Throne, that they look’d upon
 ‘ to be a *Good Man* and an encourager of true
 ‘ Religion, in that Case they did not only rea-
 ‘ dily submit to him, but acknowledg’d it as
 ‘ the great *Blessing of God* to them, that he had
 ‘ rais’d up such a Man to Rule over them. This
 ‘ was the Notion, and this was the practice of
 ‘ the Primitive Christians, as to this matter,
 ‘ I may indeed say of the Christians in all Ages,
 ‘ and

‘ and whatsoever you have heard to the contrary, I doubt not to say, that this is the very *Doctrin* of the *Church* of *England*.

‘ Let me therefore exhort all of you to be followers of *Peace*, to promote *Publick Unity* and *Concord* as much as possible; to study to be quiet and mind your own *Business*, to be more concern’d for your *Country* and *Nation*, than the *Interest* of any single *Man* in it, heartily to submit to the *Government*, and not only so, but to thank God for the *Blessings* you enjoy under it, and most heartily to pray for the continuance of them; lastly, never to espouse any *Party* or *Faction* against the *Government*, nor ever to be driven away from the *Communion* of the *Church*, of which you have always profess’d your selves *Members*, by any of the pretences, which some warm Men suggest to you.

It is certainly a principal Duty to study *Peace*, but how contrary to this *Doctrin* is the Spirit of some amongst us? The *Church* it self is divided, betrayed by her own Children, who conspire to bring her into Bondage, into the *Babylonish Captivity*. When the *Church* has escap’d the *Battering Ram*, it must be either undermin’d or thunder’d upon, We cannot avoid an eminent danger, nor accept of Deliverance, but we are accounted *Schismaticks*. When Heaven demands our Thanks, we are threatned with Fire from Heaven. The most glorious reformed *Church* is said to be excommunicated and a small Number pretend to be the true *Church* of *England*;

land ; but that is as much as to say, the Foot is the whole Body, and a Man is no Man, because he is depriv'd of a rotten Limb.

In order to satisfy those that mean Well, but are too scrupulous or prejudic'd, I shall set down an Observation, which I think on any other account not necessary. It is this, The ancient *Laws of England* determine, that when a *King* is possess'd of the Throne, and acknowledg'd by the *Estates*, his *Right* is not to be questioned. The Author of the *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, translated out of *French* by *Abraham Darcy*, and dedicated to King *James*, I. says, ' That in the ' second Year of her Reign, there were some, ' who drew against her Majesty most dangerous ' invectives and conclusions, as if she had not ' been *lawful Queen*, altho' the *Laws of Eng-* ' *land* many years before determin'd, *Que la Cou-* ' *ronne une fois prinse oste toute sorte defaults,* ' That the Crown once possess'd, cleareth, and ' purifyeth all manner of defaults, and imper- ' fections.

We cannot find, but this is the *Doctrine* of the *Church of England*, as to the concern of the Church, which does not determine us, any more than the Scripture does, in matters of *State*, except to live peaceably, as much as possible. There is a definition of a true Church, in the 19th of the 39. Articles.

' *The Visible Church is a Congregation of faith-* ' *ful Men, in which the pure Word of God is preach-* ' *ed, and the Sacraments duly administred accor-* ' *ding to Christ's Ordinance, in all things that* ' *of necessity are requisite to the same.* The

The Visible *Church* is the same still. The *Word* is now preached, and the *Sacraments* administered as before. If any thing in *Civil Government* had been necessary to the Existence of the *Church*, it shou'd not have been omitted: The *Non-jurors* account it a matter of the highest importance, which they pretend is wanting in the *Church*; Upon which account they reproach their *Mother*, and uncharitably condemn their *Brethren*; they had rather be present at *Ave-Maries* and the *Worship* of *Saints*, than communicate with us. Let them consider, whether this is not as much as to say, A *Popish Prince*, the *Blessed Virgin*, and other *Saints*, are of greater consequence to the *Church*, than the *King of Kings*, than our *Blessed Saviour*, than the *Grace* of the *Holy Spirit*. Let them consider, whether a *Protestant Church* would be more visible with, and cou'd not exist without that Prince, who was *obliged* and *prepar'd* to destroy Her. Let them consider, whether they are not the greatest *Schismatics*, who separate from the *Church*, whose *Doctrine* they believe, whose *Articles* they have subscrib'd to, and yet will not be determin'd by them.

How unreasonable is it, that the *Church* should stand upon this one Point: An exact *Descent* of *Regal Succession*; that we shou'd be *accused*, because we adhere to a *Parliamentary Settlement*, which is the most *wholsome Law* of our *Country*? But they say, we must rather let in *Popery* and suffer *Martyrdom*. I know no reason for *Christians* to dye *Martyrs* to any man's humour and pleasure,

(41)
pleasure, nor can any Prince have so great a Prerogative. We ought to *Honour*, not *Idolize* the King. But if we let the *Church* go down and then our selves suffer for *Religion*, when we might have prevented both; when we have *Laws* on our side, which we are obliged to *defend*, and ought not to *resist*; then we shou'd deserve those curses which our Adversaries so liberally bestow upon us. They say, if we shou'd dye *Martyrs* in our *Schism*, it wou'd do us no service, but certainly rather in the other Case *Martyrdom* wou'd entitle us to no *reward*, but to answer for the mischiefs, that wou'd fall upon our Posterity, and for the abominations, that wou'd be set up in our Churches.

Surely the main business of Religion is to follow our Lord Jesus Christ, in his Doctrine and suitable Practice, in *Charity*, *Concord* and *Obedience* to the *Powers in Being*, rather than to follow any particular Persons or Opinions. And since Changes of State have frequently happen'd, not only by *Permission*, but also by the *assistance* of Divine Providence; It is impossible, as well as unnecessary, that the validity of Divine Service should depend upon the Instability of human Affairs, or consist in any Person's *unalterable Right* to Govern, either in *Church* or *State*.

The *New* Seditious Doctrine is altogether inconsistent with Reason of State and with it self. It does in some sence place the *King* above our *Saviour*, and below his *Ministers*. For if the King cannot deprive *Bishops*, that are disaffected to him, he is not *Supreme* nor *Secure*. But if

the *Being* of a True Church depends on the Qualification of the Prince, then the Prince acts the Superiour part; Because his appointment of a Person to be consecrated a *Bishop*, is of greater consequence, than the Consecration it self. And if a change of Government happn'd and the *Bishops* were all of one mind, there wou'd be no true Church at all. So it might have been in Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign. For all the *Bishops* were depriv'd, being then only fourteen, besides Dr. *Heath*, Arch-Bishop of *York*.

Some were Imprison'd and some fled beyond Sea; but none of them pretended, that they could not be depriv'd, nor did contend against Queen *Elizabeth* on any other account, than of separation from the Church of *Rome*, which had first separated from the Primitive Church, and to which *England* return'd by the Reformation. The *Papists* themselves did not alledge, that we had no true Bishops, because the *Supremacy* was transferr'd from the *Pope*, to K. *Henry 8th*, when they had more Reason than we have now. But the total Deprivation by Q. *Elizabeth*, gave them occasion to report, that the Church of *England* after that had no true Bishops, for want of *Episcopal Ordination*. And so it might have happn'd, if there had not been left some Protestant Bishops, who had reform'd from *Popery* in *Edward the 6th*, time, and fled beyond Sea in Queen *Mary's* Reign. They were only four, *Barlow*, *Scory*, *Coverdale* and *Hodskins*, who consecrated Arch Bishop *Parker*, and other Bishops. Dr. *Parker* was consecrated by them

them in the Chappel at *Lambeth*, and the Original Instrument of this Consecration is in the Library of *Corpus-Christi* College in *Cambridge*. I mention this, to confute at once both the *Papists* and their *Jacobite Friends* and *Adherents*: The former say, the Church of *England* is no Church, for want of *Apostolick* Consecration; and the latter say, It is no Church, tho it have *Apostolick* Consecration, which is the greater Absurdity.

For the Consequence of this Opinion will be, that, when God permits a Change in the State, the Church must fall, (in their Imagination) tho' it is really preserved by that Change. A worse Consequence may be, (if *all* the *Bishops* were of that Opinion) that is, the Church would really fall into the same Case, which the *Papists* falsely charge her with, or else must return to *Popery*, which seems to be the Design *Now* on foot.

But if any of our Adversaries, the *Jacobites* and *Nonjurors*, have a better Meaning, and act upon a Principle of Conscience (if that's possible), they should promote Peace in the Church, after the Example of Archbishop *Heath* afore-said. ' He was moderate, and free from violent Extreams; yet he could not be prevail'd upon to take the *Oath of Supremacy*, which made him be depriv'd by Queen *Elizabeth*, as he had been before in King *Edward* the 6th's Reign; whereupon he went to his own Seat at *Cobham* in *Surry*, where he spent his Old Age in a studious and religious manner, free

‘ from *Faction* and *Revenge*. There he found
 ‘ himself rather *cas’d* than *depos’d*, and like an-
 ‘ other *Abiathar*, sent home by *Solomon* to his
 ‘ own Field; he found in his Retirement the
 ‘ Fruits of his Moderation, abounding in all
 ‘ Necessaries, and receiv’d frequent Visits from
 ‘ Queen *Elizabeth*, who was satisfied, that he
 ‘ acted from a *Principle of Conscience*. Collier’s
Dictionary.

But if all the Bishops should flee from one City to another, and from one Kingdom to another, they have not the same reason now, as in the *primitive* Times. The Christian Religion flourisheth in their own Country, their Commission extends no farther, and they would nowhere be better protected, if they did but submit to the Power in Being; and why should they not be subject to the Prince that *saves them*, rather than run into *Destruction*? Perhaps they say, God will preserve his Church, and we must wait his time: I grant it. But must we expect *Miracles*, to deliver us from *Egyptian Bondage*? Must we now expect an *Angel* to destroy our Enemies, or a *Voice* from *Heaven* to reform them? Why should we look for, or expect a Miracle, to undo the *Work of Providence*, which has sav’d us by a *Deliverance*, next to a *Miracle*? If some Bishops and inferior Ministers, with some People, should flee unto some (as yet) unknown Parts of the World, and there set up a Church; Would they not choose a *Supreme*, and would they not think that to be a true Church? But were it not

not better to accept the *Supreme* that God hath set up, and comply with the necessary Means, whereby they may enjoy their own *Country* and *Religion*, already by *Law established* ? The other *Project* would be *unaccountable* and *unreasonable* ; and the Method *impracticable*, and an *unnecessary* Temptation of Providence.

I have lately seen an Abstract of *Dr. Hicks's* Book, and that is too much for any one to read without loss of Time. I can scarcely believe it was his. I took him to be a Man of Learning, and bless'd with the meek and holy Spirit of Christianity. But this Book is a Collection of *Envy, Malice, Hatred*, and all *Uncharitableness*. It seems to be some *Jesuit's* Brat, and Father'd upon the deceas'd *Doctor*. Nor did ever *Jesuitical* Brain produce such extravagant Notions. He could easily digest *Ave-Maries* and *Prayers to Saints*. He goes beyond *Popery*, sets *Bishops* above *Princes*, and calls them *their Spiritual Subjects*. He says, that *the chief spiritual Magistrates cannot be depriv'd by their spiritual Inferiours, and have by their Commission a power to act, as he supposes the Apostles did, not only without, but expressly against the Laws and Consent of secular Powers*.

The *Apostles* had indeed a *Divine* Commission, and so have their Successors. But their Commission was not *directly*, but *accidentally*, and as little as possible against human *Laws*. It was not their Business to *oppose* the *State*, but to *preach* the *Gospel* with Meekness. Where they could not avoid acting contrary to the *Laws* and Customs

Customs of any Country, the Necessity of a Change in Religion, gave them *Licence*, and Evidences of *Divine Power* assisted them. They neither denied the *power* of the *Law*, nor refus'd the Benefit of it. They were willing to suffer according to Law, but not contrary to it, as I observ'd before, in the Example of *St. Paul*. They acknowledged the Authority of the Magistrate, and were careful not to offend, as, their *Master* was to pay Tribute to *Cæsar*.

Whatsoever Power the *Apostles* had to act contrary to Law, there is now the same Power to defend it; because then the Law was against Christianity, now *Christianity is establish'd by Law*; and we may thank God, there is now no need to oppose the Law; but there is now need to defend it, and for that we may thank our Enemies. But if they did not oppose the *Jewish* or *Heathen* Laws, much less ought we to oppose *Christian* Laws, and much more reason we have to preserve them. After *St. Paul* had preached many Years, he said to the *Roman* Governour *Festus*, (contrary to our new Doctrine) *Neither against the Law of the Jews, neither against the Temple, nor yet against Cæsar, have I offended any thing at all*, Acts xxv. 8. His Judges were of the same Opinion; and altho' *Festus* was willing to pleasure the *Jews*, (*St. Paul's* malicious Enemies) yet having heard his Defence, he agrees with King *Agrippa*, saying, *This Man doth nothing worthy of Death, or of Bonds*, Acts xxvi. 31.

Now, the *Bishops* of our Church have greater *Power, Honour, and other Advantages*, than they could claim upon the foot of the *Apostolick Commission*. But this is to be imputed to a better *Settlement* of the Church and the *Legal Establishment*. It was indeed expedient to encourage *Learning, and let the Elders that rule well, be accounted worthy of double Honour*. But then they are obliged to the *State* for these *Honours and Advantages*, as well as for their *Protection*; not entitled to any *power* opposite to the *State*; and They themselves (as *Bishops*) are included in the Command, *Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers*.

In Church-Affairs, the *Bishops* have a *distinct Power*, how great, I shall not pretend to determine; but sure the *Keys* of the *Church* were not intended to open the *Gates* of *Cities*, nor betray a *Nation* to a *Foreign Power*, nor to deprive *Men* of their *Rights*, nor to let in *Ruin* to the *Church*, nor to determine *Affairs of State*. For, who made them *Rulers and Judges* in these *Matters*? But as the *State* may preserve itself, so it may remove its *Adversaries*, without any *Detriment* to the *Church*. Whatsoever the *Apostles* might do in their *Circumstances*, the *Case* is now alter'd on divers accounts; and one of them is, It cannot be now said, that the *Labourers are few*.

I am sorry to speak with so much *Freedom* concerning the most *Reverend Episcopal Order*; but I am more sorry my *Country* has so much *Occasion* for all that can be said or done in its *Defence*,

Defence, and I desire to speak no more than is agreeable to *Reason* and *Truth*.

If I have spoken too *freely* of Government, I am willing to abide by its *censure*. If I have said any thing wrong, I am very willing to retract it, when I see a sufficient Reason so to do. But I can never be perswaded wittingly to *speak* or *act* any thing contrary to the true *Interest* of my *King*, my *Country*, and the *Liberty* of *Free-born Britons*.

I design not to *deceive*, but *undeceive* my Countrymen, and desire them to take Notice, *How* they have been deceived by *false* Insinuations, and led into an ill Opinion of those truly Valiant *Generals*, Noble *Statesmen*, and other Worthy *Instruments*, under Providence, of our Freedom from Slavery; and have deliver'd us from a Foreign *Yoke*, and from the *worse* Bondage of *Popery*. But some would return to *Egypt*, and these virulent Incendiaries murmur at our *Legislature*, because they have excluded *Popery* (if I may yet say, it is *effectually* excluded). They have been monstrously *abused*, *suspected*, *traduced*, accounted *Rebels*, *Schismatics*, *Enemies* of the Church, who have been the *only happy Instruments* to save the Church from the real Danger.

I am as *High* as any Man for the Church of England by *Law established*, and for its Doctrine of *Passive-Obedience*, that is, to the *King* in Conjunction with the *Law*; and they ought to be united: Upon which account, our *Law* saith, *The King can do no Wrong*. But without
the

the Law certainly *Passive-Obedience* is to be understood in a *limited Sence*, and I contend for *no other* Limitation, than what is necessary to the same End, for which *Obedience* and *Rulers* themselves are necessary, and from which they receive their very Being, namely, The PUBLIC SAFETY. If it had not been for this End, there had been no Rulers to obey, no Princes by Birth, no Distinctions among Men: Why then should they be set at nought, which have rais'd Men to so great Honour? Why should not the *Publick Good* be as much regarded and secured as its *Offspring*, viz. *Rulers* and *Obedience*? I appeal to any Man, whether he doth not think, that if *Man* had not fallen from a State of Innocency, there had been no Rulers at all. For the Law is not made for a *righteous Man*, but for the *Lawless* and *Disobedient*, for the *Ungodly* and for *Sinners*, for *Unholy* and *Profane*, &c. 1 Tim. i. 9. It was Sin that made Government necessary. Universal Rectitude of Mind needs no Restraint, no Rules nor Precepts of Good-Living. As *where there is no Law, there is no Transgression*; so where there is no Transgression, there is no need of Law. And as *Rulers* are not a *Terrour* to good Works, but to the evil; so where there are no Evil-doers; and all do well: there is no place for Praise, or Punishment. In this State, the Magistrate would bear the *Sword in vain*, and be himself of no use; but as the Case stands now, *Do well, and thou shalt have praise of the same*. Therefore since by reason of Sin the Good of

Mankind requires the Magistrate, we may expect to be *better*, not *worse* by him. The *Publick Good* is the Principal thing, and *he is the Minister of God to thee for Good.*

I shall add, one other Observation, in order to undeceive my Countrymen: That our Adversaries the Passive-Obedience Jacobites, both strain and restrain the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, just to fit their *Own Purpose*; they hold the *Royal Prerogative* and the *Peoples Interest* at even weight, and put their own Party Interest, or Private Advantage into either Scale, as they have occasion to serve their own Turn. They make use of both the *Higher Power* and *Inferiour Privilege* to ruin us; whereas *both* were ordain'd for, and ought to give way to, the *Publick Good*. Once a *Standing Army* was excusable, when there was no need of it; now when there is need of an Army, we are full of *Reasons against it*. Once the People were told, not to *resist*, but *accept* a *Standing Army* instead of a *Parliament*; not to speak a Word against a *Popish Prince* and a *Popish Council*, that were forming a *Popish Army*; now the People are taught to *revile* a *Protestant King*, who would keep his *Parliament*, that he may *disband* his *Army*. Once the People were taught to give up *ALL* to *Popery* and *Arbitrary Power*; now they are taught to insist *rigorously* upon the *Triennial Act*, against the Judgment of a most *Equitable Prince*, and a *Protestant Parliament*, who study to preserve *Them* and the *Protestant Religion*.

By

By this *New Law*, the Prerogative yielded to the People for the Advantage of frequent Parliaments, and what is there lost by continuing the present Parliament? Nothing of the Intention of that Act, but rather more is gain'd by it. But, they say, the Members were only chosen for *three Years*, and the People want the *Benefit* of an Election. Now they take great Care of the *People!* the *poor People!* *poor enough* like to have been. But, are the Members elected only for Election's sake? Is a Circumstance of *Time*, the *Security* of a Kingdom? Do not the People commit to their Representatives a *Discretionary Power* of acting for the *Common Interest*, for the *Main Chance*? And is it not their main Business to *consult* and *provide* for the *Publick Safety*? The end of Laws imports, that they should be preserv'd in general, and we are bound to defend them; yet particular Laws may be alter'd, as Circumstances alter, which could not be foreseen. There may be sometimes as much need to alter, as to make a Law, No Law indeed ought rashly or easily to be set aside; yet according to common Reason, and the practice of Mankind, no Law ought to be strain'd and unlimited, but that a *safe* part may be acted. It may rather happen upon a Publick Account, what ought less to be admitted, *Summum Jus Summa Injuria*.

Plutarch informs us, ' That *Marcus* was chosen *Consul* of the *Romans* the second time, notwithstanding it was directly against the Law, which expressly forbid any Man to be chosen

‘ being absent, and until a certain time had past
 ‘ between ; thereupon some opposed his Elec-
 ‘ tion, but the People answer’d, This was not
 ‘ the first time the Law had given place to the
 ‘ Benefit of the *Common Wealth*, &c. *Life of*
Marivs.

The same Author reports, ‘ That *Epaminon-*
 ‘ *das* the *Theban* General, having held his Com-
 ‘ mission four Months longer than the time ap-
 ‘ pointed by Law, was accused for it, and ho-
 ‘ nourably acquitted, altho’ this Law punished
 ‘ with Death, the breaker of it. *Life of* *Epa-*
minondas.

Nepos saith, ‘ That *Epaminondas* knowing,
 ‘ that this Law was made for the Good of the
 ‘ *Common-Wealth*, would not have it turn’d to
 ‘ its Ruin, and kept his Commission 4 Months
 ‘ longer than the People had commanded.

In the former Example, the People over-rul’d
 the Law ; in the latter, a single Person disobey’d
 the Law, and the express Order of the State.
 Why may not the *Legislative Power* of *Great-*
Britain do as much ?

But the Suspension of the *Triennial Act* is said
 to be effected, by the Influence of the Ministers
 of State, to *establish* and *secure* themselves, or to
 effect some *ill* Design. But who can better judge
 what is necessary, than the *Legislature* ? We
 have too much reason to believe, that those Mi-
 nisters would not suffer alone, if another Party
 should prevail. Can the *Legislature* only be con-
 cern’d for the Ministers of State ? We have less
 reason to think so *Now*, than at another time.

Was

Was not the Suspension of the *Habeas Corpus Act* and the raising of Forces, exclaim'd against? when those, who most exclaim'd, knew best, what occasion there was for them. The Ministers may suffer, if they deserve, as well after *seven*, as after *three* Years; but I do not see what they have deserved to suffer for, unless it be for their *vigorous Endeavours*, to secure both the *Church* and *State* by the *Protestant Succession*.

They are suspected to have something to do, which will not be acceptable to a *New* Parliament, nor stand the *Test* of the Nation. Why should they be suspected, who have always acted for the *publick Good*, and have yet, made no Attempts of *ill* Consequence? Perhaps it already appears, what they had to do, *viz.* To let the World see we are *Safe*, and to bring about an *Alliance* which may confirm our Security *without* Expence, and bring in to us, other Advantages.

I know some are ready to say, another way had been better; for themselves perhaps a little while. But I hope all truly Loyal *Britons* will say, That the *publick Good* consists in our *Laws* and *Constitution*, by which we are and hope to be for ever a *Free People*, and have our *Holy Religion* preserved to us. I doubt not, some well-meaning Gentlemen would be of the same Mind, concerning the present Government, and the *Triennial Act* in particular, if laying aside a *Party-Interest*. and some other *Inferiour* Ends, they would chiefly aim at the *Publick Welfare*.

It is a wonderful thing, that a Nation cannot secure itself, but it must be charged (for so doing) with the highest Crimes, and that a few heady self-interested Men should undermine those Fences, which the *Wisdom* and *Power* of the Nation have been setting up for almost thirty Years. I say a few Persons are the *Cause* of our Evils, having corrupted many well-meaning People, by pretences of *Conscience* and feigned *Dangers of the Church*, for the Advantage of *Popery*. But I doubt not, that as we have had cause to be awak'd by the Discovery and Disappointment of their pernicious Designs; so we shall better know, by Experience of his *Majesty's Administration*, that the Security of our *Church* and *Nation* stands firm in the *Protestant Succession*, by the Assistance of the same good *Providence*, which hath hitherto prosper'd that *Glorious Work*.

The sum of the whole Argument is, That a *Society of Men* is not obliged to let in *Ruin* to themselves, nor to let go their *Liberty*, their *Rights* and *Properties*, but may defend themselves and preserve their Laws, ought to preserve true Religion, especially being establish'd by Law, and not suffer a *corrupt* Religion to take place; ought to take care of Posterity, and deliver their Country to them, as they receiv'd it from their Fore-Fathers, altho' it happen to be against the *Prince's Will*, who can claim no other Power or Prerogative than what was by the Laws and ancient Usage deliver'd down to him. This I have prov'd from the *Law of Nature*,

ture, the *Original Nature*, and *End* of *Government*. That the general Rule of Obedience is to be understood with *Limitation* ; as with *Children* towards *Parents* ; so with *Subjects* towards *Princes* ; so as to admit of *Self-Defence*. That a Revolution or Change in the Government, founded upon **NECESSITY**, is not *Criminal*, and being remarkably *Providential*, is as much of *Divine Appointment* as any other, and more than an unjust Government. That a *legal Government* is most of all the *Ordinance of God*. That according to the *Laws* and *Customs* of *England*, Laws once made, stand good, tho' the Prince's Title was not exact in a *Lineal* or *Hereditary* Succession. That no *Hereditary* Title hath the *perfection of Descent* from the beginning, and that an *Act of Parliament* is the most *Certain* Title and *Best* Settlement. That the *Protestant Succession* was in the utmost Degree, **LAWFUL** and **NECESSARY**. That his present Majesty King **GEORGE** is the first *Heir* in *Hereditary Right*, that is *capable* by Law to govern these Kingdoms. That Princes have an Authority over their Subjects in Matters *Ecclesiastical* ; yet the *Being* of a *true Church* doth not depend on the *State*, nor consist in an *unalterable* Succession of Princes ; no such thing is found in *Scripture*, nor in the *Doctrine* of the *Church of England*, which we account the *best* Interpreter of *Holy Scripture*.

Now, I believe we have the *better* side of the Question, as well as the *greatest* Number. But grant this to be a difficult Point, the Number
equal,

equal, the Arguments equally strong on both Sides, and both Sides think themselves to be in the Right, as it is generally in all Disputes ; suppose equal Forces were drawn out, to decide by Dint of *Argument*, or perhaps by Dint of *Sword*, whether King GEORGE is *rightful King* or not, whether our *Obedience* to him, or the *Nonjurors Disobedience*, is more *just*, would not this Case appear very dubious, and threaten Ruin to both Parties ? Yet it is not a Point of Faith, nor Essential to Religion : How then can the Being of a true Church depend upon it ? Can Salvation it self depend upon the Decision of such a dubious Matter ? No, surely ; who then could be saved ? But on such accounts as these, *Charity* ought to interpose, and *unite us in the Bond of Peace*. *Him that is weak in Faith receive you, but not to doubtful Disputations*. Rom. xiv. 1. *Therefore be not like Children tossed to and fro with every Wind of Doctrine ; neither dote about Questions and Strifes of Words, whereof cometh Envy, Strife, Railings, evil Surmizings, perverse Disputings of Men of corrupt Minds, and destitute of the Truth : But be of one Mind, live in Peace, and the God of Love and Peace shall be with you.* 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

F I N I S.

